



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,884	07/10/2003	Brian M. Hatcher	10856 (UFL0009US2)	2636
23413	7590	10/03/2008		
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			EXAMINER	
20 Church Street			YOUNG, MICAH PAUL	
22nd Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Hartford, CT 06103			1618	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/03/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/616,884	Applicant(s) HATCHER ET AL.
	Examiner MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	Art Unit 1618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/30/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-16, 21, 22, 24-31, and 34-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Silver et al (USPN 5,532,217 hereafter '217). The claims are drawn to a bioactive glass composite comprising biocompatible polymer and a bioactive glass.

The '217 patent teaches a biological composite comprising mineralized fibers, bioactive glass materials and biocompatible polymers (abstract). The bioactive glass comprises a calcium and phosphate molecule (col. 2, lin. 40-49). The biocompatible polymers include gelatin, lanolin or waxes (col. 2, lin. 50-53). The composite further comprises active agents such as hormones, enzymes and growth factors such as platelet-derived growth factors (col. 2, lin. 57-68). The material is used in bone repair therapies where the material is applied to treat bone defects (abstract, col. 2, lin. 5-16). The fibers have the diameter from less than 1 micron to 500 microns

(claims). The composite is formed in a method that includes mixing the calcium with phosphate, carrier compounds and extrusion at a temperature of 37 degrees Celsius (example).

Regarding the composite at its ability to allow for the proliferation of stem cells, it is the position of the Examiner that these limitations are merely recitations of a future intended use. The claims recite that the "cells when seeded" will proliferate, meaning the composite is not yet seeded and as such any proliferation would be an inherent feature of the composite. The composite of the instant claims comprises a bioactive glass materials and biocompatible polymers, while the '217 patent teaches an identical composite. Since a compound and its properties cannot be separated, and the composite of the '217 patent is identical to that of the instant claims, it is the position of the Examiner that the composite of the '217 patent would also proliferate any seeded cells.

For these reasons the claims are anticipated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1618

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 11-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined disclosures of Silver et al (USPN 5,532,217 hereafter '217) in view of Shikinami (USPN 5,711,960 hereafter '960). The claims are drawn to a biocompatible composite comprising a biocompatible polymer, bioactive glass in the form of fibers that act as a scaffold.

As discussed above the '217 patent discloses a biocompatible composite comprising bioactive glass and a biocompatible polymer, the reference however is silent to the spacing of the fibers and their proximity to each other. The orderly arrangement of the fibers is common in the art as shown in the '960 patent.

The '960 patent discloses a biocompatible scaffold comprising a biocompatible polymer and bioactive glass on the surface of the fibers (abstract). The biocompatible polymers include polyethylene and poly-glycolic acid fibers (col. 10, lin. 50-61). Carriers for the scaffold include further biocompatible polymers such as cellulose gums and gelatin (col. 12, lin. 15-35). The bioactive glass is coated on the surface of the polymers (col. 18, lin. 29-42), and the bioactive glass polymers comprise calcium and phosphorous molecules (co. 17, lin. 45-col. 18, lin. 9). From the figures it is clear the scaffold in orderly with the fibers being placed evenly apart in order to create a scaffold configuration (Figures). The fiber scaffold has a void fraction (porosity) of 20-90% (claim 2). Though silent to specific number the fibers are arranged in an orderly fashion and appear to touch leaving the space between them less than 25 microns (Figures). It would have been obvious to arrange the fibers of the '217 as described in the '960 patent since they both provide biocompatible scaffold materials with similar components.

With these things in mind it would have been obvious to arrange the fibers of the '217 patent as seen in the '960 patent in order to improve implant stability and compression properties for implantation. It would have been obvious to apply the fiber arrangement with an expected result of a stable implantable composite useful in bone repair treatments.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bauer et al (USPN 5,338,772), Cooper et al (USPN 5,747,390) and Yuan et al (USPN 6,147,135) all disclose biocompatible scaffolds composites comprising bioactive glass materials and biocompatible polymers.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICAH-PAUL YOUNG whose telephone number is (571)272-0608. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:30; every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael G. Hartley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618

/MICAH-PAUL YOUNG/
Examiner, Art Unit 1618